



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,854	03/14/2000	Sadik Bayrakeri	19880-001610US	8158

26291 7590 11/16/2004

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN L.L.P.
595 SHREWSBURY AVE, STE 100
FIRST FLOOR
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER

BUI, KIEU OANH T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/524,854

Applicant(s)

BAYRAKERI ET AL.

Examiner

KIEU-OANH T BUI

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remark

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/19/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please refer to the Response to Arguments below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gordon et al. (U.S. Patent Pub No. 2003/0052905/ or “Gordon” hereinafter).

Regarding claim 1, Gordon discloses “a method for managing delivery of video sequences of an interactive program guide (IPG) over a communications network to a plurality of terminals” (Fig. 1 & 6A-6B, page 2/section 0013, and page 8/section 0082 for a cable television delivery system, as the server system delivers packetized video stream or video packet sequences within an applet to a plurality of terminals or to set top terminals 136 belongs to subscriber

equipments 106-1 ...106-n of Figure 1; and page 1/section 0004 for an interactive on-screen program guide addressed), the method comprising:

“pre-allocating a broadcast bandwidth in the communications network for common video sequences to be transmitted by a broadcast technique; transmitting in the broadcast bandwidth the common video sequences to the plurality of terminals by way of the broadcast technique”, i.e., this broadcast technique refers to a standard or common broadcast is provided to a terminal in the communications network whenever there is no specific technique is requested by any specific terminal or referred to as “non-specific subscriber delivery” by using appropriate bandwidth pre-allocation technique (page 11, section 0107).

“receiving a request for a specific video sequence from a specific terminal via the communications network; allocating a demandcast bandwidth in the communications network for the specific video sequence; and transmitting in the demandcast bandwidth the specific video sequence to the specific terminal via the communications network”, i.e., this specific technique refers to as per a request for a specific video sequence from a specific terminal, for instance, a pay-per-view show or a particular movie and so on, a demandcast bandwidth is provided to that specific terminal based on the request using a dynamic allocation technique, or namely, “a specific subscriber delivery” such as a point cast technique or a narrowcast technique with an individual interactive information stream is allocated for that specific terminal is provided (Fig. 20, and page 13/section 0128).

As for claims 2 and 3, in view of claim 1, Gordon further discloses “wherein the common video sequences are delivered using an in-band portion of the communications network” and “wherein the specific video sequence is delivered using the in-band portion of the

communications network”, i.e., broadcast video stream including the common video sequences and the specific video sequences, or in other words, packetized video streams, are delivered using an in-band data delivery of the communications network (page 14, section 0139).

As for claim 4, in view of claim 3, Gordon further discloses “wherein the requests are received using an out-of-band portion of the communications network”, i.e., a request from a user or a terminal is using an outside signaling system or a separate network for communicating to the communications network referred to as using an “out-of-band portion” of the communications network (page 3, section 0049 for a back channel 134 for providing commands from the user to the system via a telephone network); and as signaling or commands can either provided through an in-band data delivery or an out-of-band data delivery (page 14, section 0139).

As for claim 5, in view of claim 4, Gordon further discloses “wherein the common video sequences comprise IPG pages for a current time period”, i.e., video sequences comprising IPG pages are presented to the user in real-time with an on-screen navigator for interactively interact with programs/sessions (page 1, section 0009) and available currently displaying programs are displayed to the user with a program guide for a current time period, if not, a preview is shown (page 2, section 0016).

As for claim 7, in view of claims 1 above, Gordon further discloses “wherein transmitting the specific video sequence is performed using a narrowcast technique to a group of terminals which includes the specific terminal”, i.e., a narrowcast technique with an individual interactive information stream is allocated for that specific terminal is provided (Fig. 20, and page 13/sections 0127 & 0128).

As for claims 8 and 9, in view of claim 1, Gordon further discloses “wherein transmitting the specific video sequence is performed using a PointCast technique” and “wherein the PointCast technique comprises a shared PointCast technique”, i.e., a PointCast service and shared pointcast are used for providing information service based on the user request (page 13, section 0127 & 0128).

Regarding claim 10, Gordon discloses “a method for managing delivery of a plurality of video sequences that comprise interactive program guide (IPG) pages, the method comprising: predetermining a set of video sequences to be broadcast; allocating a broadcast bandwidth within a network with a finite bandwidth for the set of video sequences; broadcasting the set of video sequences via the broadcast bandwidth to a plurality of terminals; receiving a request from a specific terminal for a specific video sequence which is not within the set of video sequences to be broadcast; allocating a demandcast bandwidth within the network for the specific video sequence; transmitting the specific video sequence via the demandcast bandwidth to the specific terminal to fulfill the request”, i.e., see claim 1 above and further with a limitation of “predetermining a set of video sequences to be broadcast” is disclosed by Gordon as an applet containing compressed packetized video stream or video sequences (page 2, section 0013) are delivered to the set top terminal from the server in a predetermining manner in response to instructions from the user, as an applet for a linked menu waiting at the set top terminal for the user to select or command a selected movie from the server (page 8, sections 0081 & 0082).

As for claim 11, in view of claim 10, Gordon discloses “wherein the broadcasting and transmitting occur by way of in-band communications in the network, and the receiving occurs by way of out-of-band communications in the network”, i.e., the broadcasting and transmitting

occurs as broadcast video stream including the common video sequences and the specific video sequences, or in other words, packetized video streams, are delivered using an in-band data delivery of the communications network (page 14, section 0139) and the receiving occurs as a request from a user or a terminal is using an outside signaling system or a separate network for communicating to the communications network referred to as using an “out-of-band portion” of the communications network (page 3, section 0049 for a back channel 134 for providing commands from the user to the system via a telephone network); and as signaling can either provided through an in-band data delivery or an out-of-band data delivery (page 14, section 0139).

As for claim 12, in view of claim 11, Gordon further discloses “wherein the first set of video sequences comprises IPG pages for a current time period”, i.e., video sequences comprising IPG pages are presented to the user in real-time with an on-screen navigator for interactively interact with programs/sessions (page 1, section 0009) and available currently displaying programs are displayed to the user with a program guide for a current time period, if not, a preview is shown (page 2, section 0016).

As for claim 13, in further view of claim 10, Gordon further discloses “comprising: predetermining a second set of video sequences to be broadcast; and allocating a second broadcast bandwidth within the network for the second set of video sequences; and broadcasting via the second broadcast bandwidth the second set of video sequences to the plurality of terminals”, i.e., this technique refers to as per a request for a second (specific) video sequence from a (specific) terminal or a plurality of terminals, for instance, a pay-per-view show or a particular movie, a demandcast bandwidth is provided to that (specific) terminal(s) based on the

request using a dynamic allocation technique, or namely, “a specific subscriber delivery” such as a point cast technique or a narrowcast technique with an individual interactive information stream is allocated for that specific terminal is provided (Fig. 20, and page 13/section 0128).

As for claim 15, in view of claim 10, Gordon further discloses “wherein transmitting the specific video sequence to the specific terminal comprises Pointcasting the specific video sequence to the specific terminal”, i.e., a Pointcast service is used for providing information service to an individual (page 13, sections 0127 & 0128).

As for claims 16 and 17, in view of claim 15 above, Gordon further discloses “wherein transmitting the specific video sequence is performed using a narrowcast technique to a group of terminals which includes the specific terminal” and “predetermining a particular video sequence to be narrowcast to a group of terminals; allocating a narrowcast bandwidth within the network for the particular video sequence; and narrowcasting the particular video sequence via the narrowcast bandwidth to the groups of terminals”, i.e., a narrowcast technique with an individual interactive information stream is allocated for that specific terminal is clearly provided (Fig. 20, and page 13/sections 0127 & 0128).

As for claim 18, in view of claim 10, Gordon further discloses “comprising: receiving a second request from a second specific terminal for the specific video sequence; and transmitting the specific video sequence via the demandcast bandwidth to the second terminal, wherein the demandcast bandwidth comprises a single stream which is used to transmit the specific video sequence to both terminals”, i.e., Fig. 1 as for illustration of more than two terminals 136 belongs to subscriber equipments 106-1 to ...106-n requesting broadcast services; as if a specific request is sending from a second user of same network, first and second terminals receive one single

stream of specific broadcast service to them, for instance, a shared pointcast mode is applied as at least two or more users can receive a (single) particular information stream (page 13, section 0127).

As for claims 19 and 20, in view of claim 18, Gordon inherently discloses “comprising: one terminal from a group including both terminals finishing use of the specific video sequence; and continuing transmission of the specific video sequence via the demandcast bandwidth” and “comprising: another terminal from the group finishing use of the specific video sequence; and discontinuing transmission of the specific video sequence; and making the demandcast bandwidth available for re-allocation” because the broadcast technique is used herein based on the user’s preference or their choice either broadcasting, pointcasting, shared pointcasting or narrowcasting; therefore, the user of one of both terminals can do whatever he desires, e.g., ordering a video sequence or a movie, and he stills continue to use the demandcast service if he prefers to order another one or discontinue the demandcast service, and making the demandcast bandwidth available for re-allocation for the server system by having the user’s remote controller as for activating a command or not in ordering the demandcast service (page 13, sections 0126 & 0127 & 0128).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et al. above in view of Allison et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,722/ or “Allison” hereinafter).

Regarding claims 6 and 14, in view of claims 5 and 13, Gordon does not further address the step of “wherein the common video sequences further comprise IPG pages for a prime viewing time period”; however, such a technique of providing IPG pages or interactive program guide pages for a specific viewing time period such as a prime viewing time is too well-known in the art. In fact, Allison teaches a same technique in offering an interactive program guide system to viewers/users such that the viewer/user can customize their preferences based on a plurality of choices which includes a setting up of a prime viewing time of day that a particular program or event of interactive program guide can display, i.e., a prime viewing time means time people refers to watch the show the most after back home from work (Fig. 7/item 108f, col. 7/line 38 to col. 8/line 37 for details on program guide category options and col. 8/lines 9-11 for prime time setting). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gordon’s system with a known technique as disclosed in Allison’s in order to provide users/viewers the option to view their prefer layout of category or programs on their interactive program guide as suggested by Allison. The motivation for doing

this is to offer a flexible and convenience interactive program guide that offer video sequences, programs or events displaying according to the prime viewing time period as desired.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/19/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue and focus on “applets” of Gordon but tend to overlook the important concept of Gordon that “the navigator” that applicants referred to simply a tool for the users of Gordon to conveniently control and manipulate any requested sessions, but the service provider with a video session manager is mainly control the delivery of broadcasting programs, whether interactive or not and real-time or not (par. 009 & 010). In other words, the video session manager manages the bandwidth allocation for delivery to the users/subscribers in a dynamic and effective manner. Gordon discloses an exact interactive information distribution system that manages the available bandwidth whether to use broadcast, narrowcast, pointcast or shared pointcast to subscribers/users from a variety of sources including PPV, NVOD, VOD, internet services, satellite broadcasts, over-the-air broadcasts, cable broadcasts, interactive gaming, interactive shopping and etc. and video stream including MPEG (par 0048) is understood as “video sequences” (par 0104). Applicants are in error by stating that “Gordon only state that the video streams are suitable for providing the video information” because Gordon does not limit to digital stream but also to analog reception using over-the-air broadcasts (par. 0106 & 0104); furthermore, applicants misinterpret the meaning of Gordon by stating that “...maximally utilize the bandwidth...” by concluding that this present application of applicants “...prevent the usage

of extra bandwidth.” No, definitely not, it simply means “effectively use the bandwidth at the server and the subscriber side.” Gordon does not use “extra bandwidth” as noted by applicants by stating in paragraph 0107 that a “broadcast” is used by the system for “non-specific subscriber delivery” and requires less expensive transmission technique than those used for pointcast (subscriber specific delivery). Strangely, applicants are totally silent on issues of broadcasting technique of “broadcasting, narrowcasting, pointcasting or shared pointcasting” while, in fact, through out the specifications of this application (page 3, summary), applicants’ invention does the same of Gordon’s.

In addition, the “pre-allocating a broadcast bandwidth...” and “...predetermining a set of video sequences... and allocating a broadcast bandwidth” steps of claims 1 and 10 are simply disclosed by Gordon as video streams are pre-assigned or pre-allocated for different channels at different times together with their PIDs for identifying and other parameters such as sequence header location, GOP structure, coding parameters, PID locations, program map tables and other suitable information for the controller to process (par. 0123 & 0124), as soon as the user selects a object which can change the broadcast mode at the headend, an appropriate broadcast mode is used (par. 0127 & 0128). Again, if the user does not subscribe to any PPV or any interactive program (called “non specific subscriber”), Gordon does not waste the bandwidth resource by providing “extra bandwidth” to that user because it costly to do so as noted above. The present application also mentions of “shared pointcast” technique for a small group of users for “efficiently utilizes the network bandwidth allocated to pointcasts” (specifications, page 15), and Gordon does exactly the same (par. 0127 & 0128).

As for the 103 rejection, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Gordon does suggest that the IPG is broadcasting to the users at different times via different channels through out the day of 24 hours (par. 0104) including suggesting "a prime viewing time period," which simply refers to time period after work as discussed by the Examiner, and eventually, Allison teaches a same technique in offering an interactive program guide system to viewers/users such that the viewer/user can customize their preferences based on a plurality of choices which includes a setting up of a prime viewing time of day that a particular program or event of interactive program guide can display, i.e., a prime viewing time means time people refers to watch the show the most after back home from work (Fig. 7/item 108f, col. 7/line 38 to col. 8/line 37 for details on program guide category options and col. 8/lines 9-11 for prime time setting); and it serves as a motivation for users/subscribers to set up the IPG delivery during such prime time hours for enjoyment after work. The Examiner believes that the combination is perfectly proper and valid.

Therefore, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicants and stands with the disclosure and teaching of Gordon and Allison as previously disclosed in the Non Final Office action and discussed in this Final Office Action.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

8. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park I.F. 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krista Kieu-Oanh Bui whose telephone number is (703) 305-0095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 7:00 PM, with alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2611

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant, can be reached on (703) 305-4755.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Krista Bui
Art Unit 2611
November 12, 2004



KRISTA BUI
PATENT EXAMINER